



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,196	09/07/2000	David G. Ruest	END9-2000-0110 US1	1751

7590 08/03/2004
Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,196

Applicant(s)

RUEST ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant Amendment filed on 4/19/2004 has been entered and claims 1 and 11 are amended and claims 15-16 are added. As per this office Final Office Action, claims 1-16 are pending.

Drawings

2. The examiner approved proposed drawings of Fig. 3,15,16 and 17 filed on 4/19/2004.

Specification

3. Applicant's specification amendment filed on 4/19/2004 has been entered.
4. The use of the trademark EDITM has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Ex: **EDI** used on page 43, line 18.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

It is also necessary to specify the version when describing software in the specification.

5. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant need to correlate terms used in the amended claims with respect to the specification.

8. Claims 5,8 and 13 are rejected because claims contain the trademark/trade name EDI. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe interface and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite. All nonstandard abbreviations should be expanded before using in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiecha (US Patent 5,870,717), and in view of Abrams (US Patent 6,151,608).

11. As per the independent claim 1, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“receiving from a supplier via electronic data interchange a flat file catalog” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“allowing buyer audit control over selected fields in the staging table catalog while restricting buyer access to other fields” at Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 2-10;

“updating a relational database production table from said a relational database staging table, said staging table and said production table having matching formats” at Fig. 11, col. 7, lines 8;

“allowing a user read access to said relational database production table” at col. 9, lines 25-29.

Wiecha teaches updating relational database tables but does not teach explicitly loading data into relational database tables. However, Abrams teaches the following limitation:

“loading said catalog into a relational database staging table” at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 6-22.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables.

Wiecha and Abrams are combined as both teach databases and relate loading database tables with data with relevant information to view image objects. In order to view/access the data from database tables, migration has to be done using a load module.

12. As per the independent claim 11, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“receiving from a supplier via electronic data interchange a flat file catalog” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“allowing buyer audit control over selected fields in the staging table catalog while restricting buyer access to other fields” at Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 2-10;

“updating a relational database production table from said relational database staging table” at Fig. 11, col. 7, lines 8;

“allowing a user read access to said relational database production table” at col. 9, lines 25-29.

Wiecha teaches updating relational database tables but does not teach explicitly loading data into relational database tables. However, Abrams teaches the following limitation:

“loading said catalog into a relational database staging table” at Fig. 4, col. 12, lines 6-22.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables.

Wiecha and Abrams are combined as both teach databases and relate loading database tables with data with relevant information to view image objects. In order to view/access the data from database tables, migration has to be done using a load module.

13. Claims 2-10, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiecha (US Patent 5,870,717), and in view of Anderson (US Patent 6,360,211).

14. As per the independent claim 2, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“receiving a catalog flat file from a supplier” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“controlling through a graphical user interface edit access authority to said staging table and through said access control list access to fields within said staging table” at Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 2-10, col. 8, lines 35-36;

“responsive to input from a buyer granted access control list access to selected field in said staging table, updating said selected fields” at Fig. 11, col. 7, line 8;

“responsive to buyer command, updating a production catalog with said staging table for read access by users in creating requisitions against said catalog” at Fig. 11, col. 6, line 29 to col. 7, line 8.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However, Anderson teaches “converting said flat file into a staging table (i.e., intermediary database) having access control list controls over fields within said staging table” at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 28-31. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

15. As per the independent claim 3, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“a supplier catalog flat file for storing catalog items in an enterprise defined format” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“an administration function” at Fig. 7, col. 12, lines 16-23;

“a catalog administration procedure for presenting said staging table to said catalog administration function in a graphical user interface with fields of said

staging table selectively enabled or disabled for auditing in accordance with the role and authority of a user of said administration function” at Fig. 7, col. 11, line 4;

“for publishing an administration audited catalog to said production table” at Fig. 8, col. 5, lines 34-47;

“a requisition creation function operable by a user for creating a requisition with reference to said production table” at Fig. 3-4, col. 3, lines 10-47;

“a web catalog function for presenting said production table to said requisition creation function” at Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 10-13.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However, Anderson teaches the following limitations:

“a database including a staging table and a production table” at Fig. 1, 4, col. 3, lines 30 and col. 18, lines 46-51;

“an application server for receiving, converting and storing said flat file to said staging table” at Fig. 3, col. 17, lines 66-67;

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

16. As per dependent claim 4, Anderson teaches “flat file comprising catalog items stored in a column delimited format” (examiner interpreted as delimited format as ACD-PPD format) at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 64-67.

17. As per dependent claim 5, Anderson teaches “EDI means for transferring said flat file through a firewall to said application server” (it is inherent that the network will exist with a firewall) at Fig. 1, col. 23 lines 32-53 and Wiecha also teaches explicitly EDI gateway at Fig. 7, col. 4, line 53.

18. As per dependent claim 6, Wiecha teaches “graphical user interface comprising a process which loads a requisition catalog from a supplier into a production system” at Fig. 4, col. 3, lines 10-18.

19. As per dependent claim 7, Wiecha teaches “catalog administration function comprising hard coded access controls on the fields in said catalog” at Fig. 7, col. 5, lines 48-50.

20. As per the independent claim 8, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“transmitting said flat file to an enterprise system” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“accepting said flat file into an enterprise EDI mailbox” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“reformatting, validating and storing catalog data from said flat file into a staging table, with catalog indicia into a catalog staging file and catalog parts indicia into a product staging file, and alerting a buyer” at Fig. 8-9 are self-explanatory figures;

“presenting a graphical user interface to said buyer containing said catalog data and enabling said buyer for change selected fields of data in said staging table” at Fig. 4, col. 3, lines 10-18;

“responsive to buyer approval, migrating said staging table data into a production table access by a user in creating a requisition against said catalog” at col. 2, lines 4-19.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However, Anderson teaches the following limitations:

“extracting and reformatting supplier source data to create a catalog flat file in an enterprise specified column delimited -Format” (examiner interpreted as ACD-PPD format as delimited format) at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 64-67. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

21. As per dependent claim 9, Wiecha teaches “responsive to said validating step determining an error in said flat file format or data, or responsive to said buyer non approving said data in said staging table, sending a reject message to said supplier” at Fig. 7, col. 10, lines 46-55.

22. As per dependent claim 10, “fields of data in said staging table being selected for change based upon the level of authority granted by a role table to said buyer's web identifier” at Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 60-64.

23. As per the independent claim 12, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“receiving a catalog flat file from a supplier” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17,
lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“controlling through a graphical user interface edit access authority to said
staging table and through said access control list= access to fields within said
staging table” at Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 2-10, col. 8, lines 35-36;

“responsive to input from a buyer granted access control list access to selected
field in said staging table, updating said selected fields” at Fig. 11, col. 7, line 8;

“responsive to buyer command, updating a production catalog with said staging
table for read access by users in creating requisitions against said catalog” at
Fig. 11, col. 6, line 29 to col. 7, line 8.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However,
Anderson teaches “converting said flat file into a staging table (i.e., intermediary
database) having access control list controls over fields within said staging table”
at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 28-31. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into
database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables
and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store
existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

24. As per the independent claim 13, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“transmitting said flat file to an enterprise system” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17,
lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“accepting said flat file into an enterprise EDI mailbox” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“reformatting, validating and storing catalog data from said flat file into a staging table, with catalog indicia into a catalog staging file and catalog parts indicia into a product staging file, and alerting a buyer” at Fig. 8-9 are self-explanatory figures;

“presenting a graphical user interface to said buyer containing said catalog data and enabling said buyer to change selected fields of data in said staging table” at Fig. 4, col. 3, lines 10-18;

“responsive to buyer approval, migrating said staging table data into a production table access by a user in creating a requisition against said catalog” at col. 2, lines 4-19.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However, Anderson teaches “extracting and reformatting supplier source data to create a catalog flat file in an enterprise specified column delimited -Format” (examiner interpreted as ACD-PPD format as delimited format) at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 64-67. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

25. As per the independent claim 14, Wiecha rendered by the following:

“receiving a catalog flat file from a supplier” at Fig. 1, 6, col. 3, lines 10-17, lines 59-61 and col. 14, lines 59-60;

“controlling through a graphical user interface edit access authority to said staging table and through said access control list access to fields within said staging table” at Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 2-10, col. 8, lines 35-36;

“responsive to input from a buyer granted access control list access to selected field in said staging table, updating said selected fields” at Fig. 11, col. 7, line 8;

“responsive to buyer command, updating a production catalog with said staging table for read access by users in creating requisitions against said catalog” at Fig. 11, col. 6, line 29 to col. 7, line 8.

Wiecha does not teach explicitly converting flat files into tables. However, Anderson teaches “extracting and reformatting supplier source data to create a catalog flat file in an enterprise specified column delimited -Format” (examiner interpreted as ACD-PPD format as delimited format) at Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 64-67. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to explicitly stating data loading into database tables. Wiecha and Anderson both teach updating database tables and to relate the technique of converting flat files into tables. In order to store existing data in tables flat files are converted/loaded.

26. As per dependent claim 15, Wiecha teaches “responsive to said validating step determining an error in said flat file format or data, or responsive to said buyer non approving said data in said staging table, sending a reject message to said supplier” at

Fig. 9 is a self explanatory as stated content errors are notified to the content provider (supplier).

27. As per dependent claim 16, Wiecha teaches "said fields of data in said staging table being selected for change based upon the level of authority granted by a role table to said buyer's web identifier" at Fig. 9 is a self explanatory as stated batch diagnostics 256 is content errors rectifiable are diagnosed.

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 4/19/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

A) Applicants argument stated as "Claims 12-14 have not been explicitly rejected in the body of the Office Action."

In response to applicants' argument, Examiner agrees that the rejection of claims 12-14 are not listed in the item/paragraph 14. However, they were rejected under the same group.

B) Applicants argument stated as "With respect to claims 1 and 11, applicants note that the Wiecha invention encompasses the scope of loading a catalog EDI into a DB2 table to be used by online ordering."

In response to applicants' argument, examiner disagrees because the EDI is not defined or expanded in the specification and the amended terms

"electronic data interchange" in claims 1 and 11, does not support the specification.

Further, the new dependent claims 15-16 are also rejected by the same prior art.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

srp
July 27, 2004


GRETCHEN ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER